



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 08/781,920      | 12/30/1996  | TAKESHI FUKUNAGA     | 0756-1614           | 8849             |

22204 7590 11/25/2002

NIXON PEABODY, LLP  
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE  
SUITE 800  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

PADGETT, MARIANNE L

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 1762     | 49           |

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

|                    |             |                       |                     |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

21

**DATE MAILED:**

49

**Below is a communication from the *EXAMINER* in charge of this application  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**

## **ADVISORY ACTION**

**THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.**

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check only a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07(f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.

3.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
- (b)  they raise the issue of new matter. (see NOTE below);
- (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

**NOTE:** While the amendment to claim 76 removes the New Matter issue of crystallization via laser without catalyst, the generic "irradiating without specific effect" is a new issue, as is the addition of patterning to claims 76, 80, 84, 87, and the specific structure formation of claim 79, 83, 91-92. Independent claims 80, 84, 98-98 have also been retroactively

4.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s), except by defining CPU as central processing unit, EXCEPT that "CPU" is deleted from the specification (not just defined), but the acronym is left in claims 71-75. Other all CPU should have been replaced or the acronym should have been left with its definition in the specification.  
 5.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a specification separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

6.  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: There are many new SSp's to be considered for claim No. 92.

*and no Change in the arguments/claims for claims 24-25.*  
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

**Claim(s) allowed:** \_\_\_\_\_.

**Claim(s) objected to:** \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 24-92

**Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:** \_\_\_\_\_.

9.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a)  has b)  has not been approved by the Examiner.

10.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

11.  Other: altered in other step processes (80 - addition of insulating film between steps + removal heating step);  
as 84 - removal of any crystallization necessary taking place, addition of metal, type and purpose unspecified  
the semiconductor layer; claim 85 adds a new heating step in an atmosphere  
"composed of nitrogen". These all create new issues that must be evaluated  
Support (New Matter) in their context in the proposed claims just reviewed  
in respect to prior art.